



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,295	07/24/2003	William E. Spink JR.	FCI-2679/C3319	3642
23377	7590	12/07/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR 1650 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				VU, HIEN D
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2833		

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,295	SPINK, WILLIAM E.	
	Examiner Hien D. Vu	Art Unit 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,9-16,18,19,21,22,24-32 and 34-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,7,8,17,20,23 and 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,9-16,18,19,21,22,24-32 and 34-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/20/03</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 2833

1. Applicant's election of species 1, figs. 1-9, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-32 and 34-37 in paper dated 8/31/04 is acknowledged.
2. The drawings are objected to because figs. 2-6, 10-18 are not clearly shown the structure of elements. Applicant is requested to submit a new set of drawings of figs. 2-6, 10-18 for examination.
3. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: section (0044), line 6, the terms used for element (32) are not consistent; (section (0046), lines 2 & 4 and section (0047), line 2, the terms used for element (32a) are not consistent; section (0053), lines 4, 6 and section (0054), lines 1, 2, 4, the terms used for element (38) are not consistent. Applicant is required to review the entire disclosure and make corrections where necessary.
4. Claims 2-3, 6, 9, 10, 13-16, 22 and 31 are objected to because in claim 2, line 4, "first" appears to be -- second --; claims 6, 22, 31 features are unclear since they are not clearly shown in the drawings; claims 9 and 24 are unclear since they are not clearly shown in the drawings; claim 13, "first" appears to be – second --.
5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-32 and 24-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemke et al (6,024, 584) in view of Lindeman (794) and Kandybowski et al (764).

Insofar as the claims can be understood, the reference of Lemke (584), Lindeman (794) and Kandybowski (764) are applied as follows: Lindeman, Figs. 5-7c disclose substantially the claimed invention except for a first electrically conductive member and a second electrically conductive member each having attachment features electrically and mechanically to a plurality locations on the first and second substance respectively. Lindeman, figs. 1-5 show a first conductive member 17 and a second conductive member 18 each having attachment features (17a, 17b, 18, 18a) electrically and mechanically to plurality locations on first and second substrate (not shown). It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Lemke by replacing the first and second conductive members (182, 66) with the first and second conductive members as described above, as taught by Lindeman, in order to provide easier assembly.

As to claim 2, Lemke in view of Lindeman do not show the second conductive member having a plurality of attachment tabs. Kandybowski, fig. 2 shows a second conductive member 76 having a plurality of attachment tabs 78. It would have been obvious to modify the connector of Lembe in view of Lindeman by forming the second conductive member with attachment tabs, as taught by Kandybowski, in order to provide easier assembly.

As to claims 3, to form the first conductive member in a staged arrangement with the first attachment tabs being offset from each of the mating tabs would have been obvious of modification since such change solve no stated problem.

As to claim 5, a first connector half 10 with first contacts 84 a second connector half with second contacts 192.

As to claim 6, figs. 5& 6 in Lembe show a barrier (not labeled).

As to claim 9, figs. 1-2 in Lemke show a body 10 having a plurality of projections (not labeled) for contact the body portion of the first conductive member 66.

As to claim 10, to form the total number of the mating tabs to be less than the total member of the first attachment tabs would have been obvious of modification since such changes solves no stated problem.

As to claim 11, first and second of fusible elements (82, 100, 190, 200) as shown in fig. 5 of Lemke.

As to claim 12, a contact blade 18 as showed in fig. 1 & 8 of Lindeman.

Claims 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-32 and 34-37 have similar recitations as claims described above therefore these claims are rejected under a similar rationale.

7. Shindo, Johnson et al, Adams, Shuey, Ellis et al and Perugini et al are cited for disclosure of electrical connectors having shielding means.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien D. Vu at telephone number (571) 272-2016.

Vu/ds

11/20/04


HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER